

## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7-12, 14-18 and 23-26 are pending. Applicants respectfully note that the instant Office Action indicates incorrectly that Claim 3 is pending.

### Specification

The instant Office Action refers to the use of the trademark "Bluetooth" in the instant application. Applicants respectfully note that the specification was amended in the submission dated July 29, 2005, to capitalize the term "Bluetooth," as instructed.

### 103 Rejections

#### Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14, 17-18 and 25-26

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14, 17-18 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011467) in view of Yoshizawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036273). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14, 17-18 and 25-26 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination.

Independent Claim 1 recites a method that includes "designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices." Independent Claim 9 recites a system that executes a method that includes "receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used

for subsequent connections with said device.” Independent Claim 17 recites a computer-usable medium for causing a device to perform a method that includes “receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices.”

The instant Office Action cites paragraphs 0044 and 0051 of Suomela as disclosing these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree, for the reasons below.

In essence, embodiments in accordance with the present claimed invention include at least the following claimed features: i) a “trusted device” (which is defined by the claims) is distinguished from non-trusted devices in a list of devices within wireless range; and ii) a user can make a choice as to whether or not a device should be designated as a trusted device.

However, neither the cited portions of Suomela, nor Suomela in its entirety, show or suggest these claimed features. The database 230 of Suomela includes a listing of accessible devices, sorted by user. However, the database 230 makes no distinction between trusted devices and non-trusted devices. That is, if the database 230 is read as listing both trusted and non-trusted devices, then there is no teaching in Suomela that the trusted and non-trusted devices in the listing are somehow distinguishable from each other, in contrast to the claimed invention. “Moreover, only the ubiquitous devices that the requesting user is authorized to access are displayed on the map” (see paragraph 0051 of Suomela). Applicants respectfully submit that, at best, Suomela only shows a listing of trusted devices,

whereas according to the present claimed invention, both trusted and non-trusted devices are listed, and whereas further a trusted device can be distinguished from a non-trusted device, and vice versa.

Applicants further submit that Yoshizawa does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest “designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1; “receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device” as recited in independent Claim 9; or “receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 25 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-12 and 14 dependent on Claim 9, and Claims 18 and 26 dependent on Claim 17, and that Claims 2, 10-12, 14, 18 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis

for rejecting Claims 1-2, 9-12, 14, 17-18 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 7, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Baptist et al. ("Baptist;" U.S. Patent No. 5,465,392). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 15 and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination.

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest "designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices" as recited in independent Claim 1; "receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device" as recited in independent Claim 9; or "receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a

trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination, because Claims 7, 15 and 23 recite additional limitations. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 7, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

#### Claims 8, 16 and 24

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Sormunen et al. (“Sormunen,” U.S. Patent No. 6,112,078). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 8, 16 and 24 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination.

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest “designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list such that said device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1; “receiving a user input indicating that said device is being designated a trusted device, wherein as a trusted device said passkey is to be automatically used for subsequent connections with said device” as recited in independent Claim 9; or “receiving a user input indicating that said other device is being designated a trusted device ... and indicating that said other device is a trusted device in said list such that said other device is distinguished from devices in said list that are not trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination, because Claims 8, 16 and 24 recite additional limitations. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8, 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-2, 7-12, 14-18 and 23-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis  
Reg No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060

Date: 2/17/06